

**UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
FOR THE
EASTERN DISTRICT OF PENNSYLVANIA**

NICOLE ANDEL,
Plaintiff

V.

WELLS FARGO BANK, N.A.,
Defendant

$$\begin{array}{c}) \\) \\) \\) \\) \\) \\) \\) \\) \end{array}$$

Case No.:

COMPLAINT AND DEMAND FOR JURY TRIAL

COMPLAINT

NICOLE ANDEL (“Plaintiff”), by and through her attorneys, KIMMEL & SILVERMAN, P.C., alleges the following against WELLS FARGO BANK, N.A. (“Defendant”):

INTRODUCTION

1. Plaintiff's Complaint is based on the Telephone Consumer Protection Act ("TCPA").

JURISDICTION AND VENUE

2. Jurisdiction of this Court arises pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 1331. See *Mims v. Arrow Fin. Services, LLC*, 132 S. Ct. 740, 747, 181 L. Ed. 2d 881 (2012).

3. Defendant conducts business in the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania
and as such, personal jurisdiction is established.

1 4. Venue is proper pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 1391(b)(2).

2 **PARTIES**

3 5. Plaintiff is a natural person residing in Philadelphia, Pennsylvania
4 19116.

6 6. Plaintiff is a “person” as that term is defined by 47 U.S.C. § 153(39).

7 7. Defendant is a business entity with its principal place of business
8 located at 420 Montgomery Street, San Francisco, California 94104.

10 8. Defendant is a “person” as that term is defined by 47 U.S.C.
11 §153(39).

12 9. Defendant acted through its agents, employees, officers, members,
13 directors, heirs, successors, assigns, principals, trustees, sureties, subrogees,
14 representatives, and insurers.

16 **FACTUAL ALLEGATIONS**

17 10. Plaintiff has a cellular telephone number.

18 11. Plaintiff has only used her number as a cellular telephone number.

19 12. Defendant called Plaintiff on her cellular telephone on a repetitive
20 and continuous basis.

21 13. When contacting Plaintiff, Defendant used an automatic telephone
22 dialing system and automatic and/or pre-recorded messages.
23
24
25

1 14. Plaintiff knew Defendant was calling her using an automatic telephone
2 dialing system and automatic and/or pre-recorded messages as she received calls
3 from Defendant that began with a delay or pause prior to a live representative of
4 Defendant coming on the line.
5

6 15. Defendant's telephone calls were not made for "emergency purposes."

7 16. Desiring to stop these repeated, unwanted calls, Plaintiff spoke to
8 Defendant soon after the calls began and revoked any previous consent that
9 Defendant had to contact her.
10

11 17. Defendant heard and acknowledged this request to stop calling.

12 18. Once Defendant was aware that its calls were unwanted and was told
13 to stop calling, there was no lawful purpose to making further calls, nor was there
14 any good faith reason to place calls.
15

16 19. In spite of her repeated instruction to stop calling her cellular
17 telephone, Defendant instead continued to call her repeatedly.
18

19 20. Plaintiff found Defendant's repeated calls to be harassing, invasive,
20 frustrating, annoying, and upsetting.

21 21. Upon information and belief, Defendant conducts business in a
22 manner which violates the Telephone Consumer Protection Act.
23
24
25

COUNT I
DEFENDANT VIOLATED THE
TELEPHONE CONSUMER PROTECTION ACT

22. Plaintiff incorporates the forgoing paragraphs as though the same were set forth at length herein.

23. Defendant initiated multiple automated telephone calls to Plaintiff's cellular telephone using an automatic telephone dialing system and automatic and/or pre-recorded messages

24. Defendant's calls to Plaintiff were not made for "emergency purposes."

25. After Plaintiff told Defendant to stop calling, the Defendant knew or should have known it did not have consent to call and/or that any consent it thought it had was revoked, yet willfully and/or knowingly continued to place calls to Plaintiff's cellular telephone using an automatic telephone dialing system and/or pre-recorded voice.

26. Defendant's acts as described above were done with malicious, intentional, willful, reckless, wanton and negligent disregard for Plaintiff's rights under the law and with the purpose of harassing Plaintiff.

27. The acts and/or omissions of Defendant were done unfairly, unlawfully, intentionally, deceptively and fraudulently and absent bona fide error, lawful right, legal defense, legal justification or legal excuse.

28. As a result of the above violations of the TCPA, Plaintiff has suffered the losses and damages as set forth above entitling Plaintiff to an award of statutory, actual and trebles damages.

PRAAYER FOR RELIEF

WHEREFORE, Plaintiff, NICOLE ANDEL, respectfully prays for a judgment as follows:

- a. All actual damages suffered pursuant to 47 U.S.C. § 227(b)(3)(A);
- b. Statutory damages of \$500.00 per telephone call pursuant to 47 U.S.C. § 227(b)(3)(B);
- c. Treble damages of \$1,500.00 per telephone call pursuant to 47 U.S.C. § 227(b)(3) or alternatively that amount for all calls made after Defendant was notified that they were calling the wrong person and wrong number;
- d. Injunctive relief pursuant to 47 U.S.C. § 227(b)(3);
- e. Any other relief deemed appropriate by this Honorable Court.

DEMAND FOR JURY TRIAL

PLEASE TAKE NOTICE that Plaintiff, NICOLE ANDEL, demands a jury trial in this case.

1 RESPECTFULLY SUBMITTED,

2 DATED: June 12, 2020

KIMMEL & SILVERMAN, P.C.

3
4 By: /s/ Amy L. B. Ginsburg
5 AMY L. B. GINSBURG, ESQ
6 Attorney ID # 202745
7 Kimmel & Silverman, P.C.
8 30 E. Butler Pike
9 Ambler, PA 19002
10 Phone: (215) 540-8888
11 Fax: (877) 788-2864
12 Email: teamkimmel@creditlaw.com
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25